

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/799,611	03/15/2004	Kristoffer Hess	K8000143US3B	8421	
34236	7590 07/22/2005		EXAMINER		
VALENTINE A. COTTRILL			GREEN, BRIAN		
SUITE 1020 50 QUEEN STREET NORTH KITCHENER, ON N2H6M2			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CANADA	,		3611		
			DATE MAILED: 07/22/2009	DATE MAILED: 07/22/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/799,611	HESS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAN INO DATE AND	Brian K. Green	3611				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)  Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5)  Claim(s)  is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 11-14 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s)  is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s)  are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:					

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Species I. Figures 29-32;

Species II. Figures 33-35.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, none of the claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Page 3

Art Unit: 3611

During a telephone conversation with Valentin Cottrill on July 19, 2005 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Species II. (figures 33-35), claims 11-14. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-10 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,395,476).

Moss et al. shows in figures 1-4 a flame simulating assembly comprising a simulated fuel bed (3), a light source (4), a screen (9) positioned behind the simulated fuel bed for transmitting and diffusing light, the screen including a plurality of curved portions (13), each of the curved portions adapted to attenuate the image of flames upon transmission through the screen to give at

Art Unit: 3611

least a portion of the flames a three-dimensional appearance, and a flicker element (5) for causing light from the light source to fluctuate to form the image of flames.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,395,476).

Moss et al. discloses the applicant's basic inventive concept except for placing the curved portions randomly on the screen. The applicant discloses in the specification on page 34, paragraph 00120, that the curved portions do not have to be randomly placed on the screen. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Moss et al. to randomly place the curved portions on the screen since the applicant fails to provide any advantage to placing the curved portions randomly on the screen and the arrangement of the curved portions on the screen taught by Moss et al. would work equally well. In regard to claim 13, the curved portions on opposite ends of the screen are spaced apart.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,395,476) in view of Martin et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,393,207).

Moss et al. discloses the applicant's basic inventive concept except for placing a flame effect element between the flicker element and the screen. Martin et al. shows in figure 3 the idea of

Application/Control Number: 10/799,611

Art Unit: 3611

placing a flame effect element (86) between the flicker element (84) and the screen (114). In

view of the teachings of Martin et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify

Moss et al. by placing a flame effect element between the flicker element and the screen since

this would create a more realistic and aesthetically pleasing flame effect.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Brian K. Green whose telephone number is (571) 272-6644. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (571) 272-6651. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Trian K. Theen

Page 5

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Bkg

July 20, 2005